



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,360	03/20/2001	Michael S. German	UCSF-129CIP	2345

7590 09/27/2002

Carol L. Francis
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
200 Middlefield Road, Suite 200
Menlo Park, CA 94025

EXAMINER

WHITEMAN, BRIAN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1635

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,360

Applicant(s)

GERMAN, MICHAEL S.

Examiner

Brian Whiteman

Art Unit

1635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-27 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required and an election of species is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-26, drawn to an in vivo method of delivering insulin to the bloodstream of a mammalian subject, the method comprising: administering a formulation to a pancreatic cell of a mammalian subject, the formulation comprising a nucleic acid encoding an islet transcription factor, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
- II. Claim 12-27, drawn to a method for delivering insulin to the bloodstream of a mammalian subject, the method comprising: introducing an islet cell produced by the method of claim 25 into a pancreas of a mammalian subject, classified in class 424, subclass 93.21.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

As set forth in *In re Harnisch* (631F.2d 716 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980), see MPEP 803.02, unity of invention exists for all species in a claim (1) shows a common utility, and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility.

In view of *In re Harnisch*, claims 12-27 lack unity of invention for the following reasons:

1) an in vivo method of delivering insulin to the bloodstream of a mammalian subject, 2) a method for delivering insulin to the bloodstream of a mammalian subject, the method comprising: introducing a genetically modified cell comprising an islet transcription factor into a pancreas of a mammalian subject. An in vivo method of gene therapy does not have a common

Art Unit: 1635

utility with an *ex vivo* method of gene therapy. Therefore in view of *In re Harnisch*, claims 12-27 lack unity of invention and are separated into distinct groups as shown in Groups I and II.

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in MPEP 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because each of the methods of inventions I and II, constitutes patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Each of the inventions is directed to different goals and comprises materially distinct steps, wherein each of the compositions in each invention is structurally distinct and/or generates distinct mechanisms and functional effects. For example, the method in Group I is an *in vivo* method of gene therapy and the method in Group II is an *ex vivo* method of gene therapy comprising isolating a cell from a mammal, genetically modifying the cell, and re-introducing said genetically modified cell back into the mammal. The scope of each of the cited inventions encompasses an employed method, which generates distinct function(s) and effect(s), and furthermore does not necessarily overlap with that of another invention. Inventions I and II comprise materially distinct steps, and/or generate different functions and effects, and thus, are not required for use with one another. Therefore the invention of group I is distinct from group II.

If applicants elect group I applicants are further required to elect a species from the following:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: an islet transcription factor set forth in claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 21, 22, 23.

Art Unit: 1635

Applicant is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 12, and 19 are generic.

If applicants elect group II applicants are further required to elect a species from the following:

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: an islet transcription factor set forth in claims 13, 14, 16, 21, 22, and 23.

Applicant is further required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 12 and 19 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 1635

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

It would be unduly burdensome for the examiner to search and consider patentability of all of the presently pending claims, a restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kay Pinkney whose telephone number is (703) 305-3553.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Whiteman whose telephone number is (703) 305-0775. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 to 5:00 (Eastern Standard Time), with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's mentor, primary examiner, Dave Nguyen can be reached at (703) 305-2024.

Application/Control Number: 09/817,360

Page 6


Art Unit: 1635

If attempts to reach the primary examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John L. LeGuyader, SPE - Art Unit 1635, can be reached at (703) 308-0447.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center number is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Brian Whiteman
1635
9/28/02



DAVE T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER